



Minutes of the Senate meeting of Monday 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2016

A meeting of the Senate of Acadia University occurred on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2016 beginning at 4:00 p.m. with Chair Ann Vibert presiding and 36 present, plus one guest.

**1) Approval of Agenda**

The Chair stated that before the agenda could be approved she would like to remove Item 6) a) from the agenda. Item 6) b) would be renumbered to become 6) a) *Notice of Motion from the By-laws committee.*

There were no objections to this change.

**Motion to approve the agenda as amended moved by B. Anderson, seconded by J. Hennessy.**

AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA APPROVED.

**2) Minutes of the Meeting of 22<sup>nd</sup> February, 2016**

**Motion to approve the minutes of February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016. Moved by J. Banks, seconded by H. Wylie.**

D. Holmberg requested that on page 10, paragraph 4, the wording *Neuroscience option and a Science option* should be changed to read *Neuroscience option and an Applied Psychology Science option.*

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS REVISED CARRIED.

**3) Announcements**

**a) From the Chair of Senate**

The Chair noted regrets from I. Hutchinson, J. Yang, E. Samson, F. Thompson and R. Seale.

The Chair welcomed T. Weatherbee from the Academic Planning Committee to the Senate meeting.

There were no objections to T. Weatherbee attending.

**b) From the President**

President Ivany extended his gratitude to D. Duke for coordinating Acadia's delegation to the U4 event held at Bishop's University. This was the inaugural event of the U4 league three years ago. A. Cohen and a number of students attended and the event included a formal debate in addition to a number of TEDx talks. President Ivany noted that all of the events were very successful and included a great deal of collaboration.

President Ivany also noted that he attended the national meeting in Montreal of the Universities of Canada at which the subject of discussion was the future of the liberal arts. This discussion had been prompted by the changes in

enrolment patterns that were being seen across North America and was also spurred on by the reasons that Acadia participated in the creation of the U4, which was the rarity of Acadia's model in higher education. President Ivany pointed out that going back 10 or 15 years, the number of institutions that had looked like Acadia no longer did so now. He agreed that the question of whether Canadian higher education in the future would include a cohort of institutions that were pursuing the high quality and high engagement approach of Acadia was an issue worthy of discussion.

President Ivany pointed out that it was vital to communicate, through promotional literature, the different approaches that are taken by Acadia and what the academic model looks like.

President Ivany noted that the U4 league had significant potential to be complimentary to what Acadia itself needed to be doing.

**c) Report from the VP Academic**

R. Perrins had no announcements.

**4) Time Sensitive Items**

**a) Report and Nominations from the Awards Committee (*previously circulated*)**

**Report and Nominations from the Awards Committee for the candidates for Honorary Degree status.**

President Ivany noted that it was a privilege to serve on this committee and thanked Senators and colleagues for carrying out a more rigorous job in selecting candidates, both in the quality and the number of individuals that were recommended.

President Ivany reminded Senators that the current policy allowed names to be carried forward for three cycles so that there was a good opportunity for them to be considered in a future year.

President Ivany noted that material on all of the candidates had been circulated to Senators and also that all of the candidate nominations had been supported unanimously by the Awards committee.

President Ivany briefly described all six candidates for Honorary Degrees of Science, Humanities, Civil Laws and Divinity.

A. Quema pointed out that only two women were on the list of nominations.

President Ivany responded that this had been discussed at length by the Awards committee and that although there was not gender parity this year the committee still felt comfortable with the quality of the nominations. He noted that the committee was still receiving a higher weighting of males than females at the nominating stage and that this weighting was even higher than the final awards which were to four males and two females. President Ivany was optimistic that the gender balance would be better next year.

G. Poulter asked why one of the candidates was to be awarded an Honorary Doctor of Humanities when his background was in Science.

President Ivany responded that because the individual's work had been in Kinesiology and Community Development it was felt that it fitted more into an Honorary Doctor of Humanities.

A secret ballot was conducted.

CANDIDATES FOR HONORARY DEGREES APPROVED.

**Report and Nominations from the Awards Committee for the candidates for Professor Emeritus status.**

President Ivany noted that the three candidates for Professor Emeritus status required no introductions and were of a high quality and known to all.

- S. Bondrup-Neilson
- S. MacDougall
- A. Thomson

P. Williams asked President Ivany whether the Awards committee had considered the request for Instructor Emeritus.

President Ivany responded that the Awards committee had considered this and would have a recommendation coming to Senate for the next cycle of nominations.

P. Williams asked whether there would also be an extended window for nominations associated with Instructor Emeritus.

President Ivany noted that this had not yet been discussed but that his own view was that the same process as was adopted by the committee in the case of Professors should be followed for Instructors.

President Ivany suggested that schools and departments get to a point where it became automatic for them to consider individuals that were retiring or leaving for Emeritus status. He pointed out that this had not happened in the past and individuals had as a result been overlooked, which resulted in the need to look back several years. Now that the Awards committee was no longer looking back more than one year it was crucial that individuals were caught at the time of their departure.

A secret ballot was conducted.

CANDIDATES FOR PROFESSOR EMERITUS STATUS APPROVED.

P. Williams asked whether an individual could be nominated for Professor Emeritus status posthumously.

President Ivany stated that it was not clear to the Awards committee whether this could be done as the current terms of reference were silent on this option. It was also not clear whether precedence had been set previously. He noted that the committee decided to forego a decision this year in order to bring forward a recommendation to Senate during the next cycle. The Awards committee preferred to survey what the norm was at other institutions. President Ivany indicated that if Senate decided to open this up to posthumous nominations it would be expected that the nomination that had been made this year would then be carried forward to next year for consideration.

5) Carried over from the  
February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016 Senate  
Meeting

a) Academic Planning  
Committee Report –  
Identification of Themes  
from the Raw Data

The Chair reminded Senators that the APC was tasked with identifying themes from the raw data that resulted from the ‘big picture’ discussions at Senate in December 2015. One non-Senate member of the APC was present. Senators had been provided with the PowerPoint presentation from the APC.

R. Perrins explained that the APC only considered the raw data responses relating to Question 1.

- **“What are the preeminent curriculum/academic program principles and priorities you want to see a future Acadia work toward and/or enact?”**

R. Perrins stated that the APC had met on a number of occasions and that the six themes that the committee had identified were as follows:

- Maintain yet clarify what we mean by a “liberal education”
- Our focus must be a student-centric orientation for education
- An integrated Academic Sector
- Responding to 21<sup>st</sup> Century concerns
- Community Connections/Engagement as part of the Acadia experience
- Supporting strategic research initiatives

R. Perrins noted that between the members of the APC there were huge similarities in views. These themes were now coming to Senate for discussion and the committee would welcome edits, with the expectation that they would bring a motion to the floor of Senate in April 2016. Senate would be asked at that time to affirm that these were the themes that came out of the ‘big picture’ discussions so that the APC would have some direction moving forward. These themes would then be applied to question 2.

- **“Given our current strengths and resources, and given the current university context provincially and federally, how would you imagine operationalizing these principles and priorities? What supports /obstacles might you expect?”**

A. Quema agreed that there was a community of ideas on campus despite the various differences, tensions and dissent. A. Quema felt that some of the themes could be re-titled and that there could be some disagreement on some of the content on the slides. She felt that there was a need to address Question 2 which looked at how to implement or reinforce some of the things that were already being done.

A. Quema felt that there was a desire to preserve certain principles that required for instance small classes, and that the University would find the means to sustain them.

A. Quema felt that the six slides were a pretty accurate account of what Acadia aspired to be.

D. Holmberg agreed that the APC had captured the main themes well. Also D. Holmberg agreed with bullet point #2 but noted that what was best for the students was not always what the students necessarily wanted.

G. Gibson, referring to bullet point #2, felt that a liberal education needed to offer lots of research opportunities of different sorts and for lots of students and hoped that this was the type of framework that would be built, rather than targeting undergraduates to work on certain strategic plans. G. Gibson felt that research opportunities should span all four years of the curriculum if at all possible.

J. Stanley asked whether the APC struggled with trying to define “Community” in bullet point #5.

R. Perrins responded that the committee tried to think as broadly as possible. Specific feedback from Senators would be useful to the committee since it had limited itself to the data that came from the December meeting. This would be the forum to clarify what was really wanted.

President Ivany agreed with A. Quema that the narrative was contained in the document but also felt that Senate needed to be concerned with the principles, goals and objectives for an Acadia student. Once these were set by Senate this would put the whole Institution on notice that there were mechanisms and concrete changes to be made in order to align to these principles. President Ivany stressed the importance of the APC remaining at a higher level rather than being pulled down to a micro level of discussion.

President Ivany also encouraged Senators to make a declaration at whatever level they decided to do so, on the work that had been carried out to date during this cycle of Senate. This would be important for a couple of reasons. It would bring to a conclusion the conversations that had been held and there was a danger that if this continued on into another cycle, momentum and focus could be lost. The second reason was that the University was going into a year during which a Presidential search would be underway and it was important for Senate to have the declaration in place so that potential candidates could then be informed by that declaration. This approach would effectively close the loop.

B. Robinson requested some changes to the language being used in bullet #3 and felt that the words ‘constrained’ and also ‘*must be the exception*’ could be softened so that there were not negative connotations.

P. Abela raised concerns about the process that he felt was unfolding. He felt that a certain amount of mission *creep* had occurred and felt that Senate needed to register this fact. He noted that the University already had a Strategic Plan and wondered how these registered beliefs of Senate were engaging the Strategic Plan. P. Abela also wondered how many years it might take for Senate to consider five more questions that came out of recommendations from the Senate Executive.

P. Abela referred to bullet #2 and the comment that faculty and librarians support the experiences of the students. He noted that sometimes it was also important for faculty to make the students feel uncomfortable and to shatter biases that they might bring to the classroom, thereby opening their minds. He felt that the relationship between the professor and the student was not

completely captured by the comments because it portrayed the professors in a supporting role, whereas at times they needed to play a challenging role.

P. Abela referred to bullet #3 in the context of the 3 semester model. He asked what the model was suggesting.

P. Abela referred to bullet #4 with respect to participation, noting that in Philosophy part of a students' education was the garnering and development of a mobile set of skills. These could be taken away from the Institution and deployed independently of the content that was being learned. These skills could be harder to develop in one of the larger institutions in Canada. Some expression of this multi-set of skills language would capture what was in the title of bullet #4.

R. Worvill responded that in the case of the 3 semester model there had been conversation about the fact that in the past a degree would be three years but now took four years to complete. Discussion in the small groups had also covered alternative ways in which a student could accumulate their credits but spend less in the process. Teaching over the summer could be considered.

L. Aylward pointed out that Senate had received an excellent presentation from the School of Music at the previous meeting, on this topic. At the macro level it would be very difficult to come up with language that everyone could agree upon and would be clear and understandable. L. Aylward cautioned Senate to be careful as to what literature was referred to when deciding upon the final language.

D. Holmberg also stressed that the language needed to remain flexible under bullet #3 especially in the area of integration.

B. Anderson commented that there had been a great deal of reflection after the School of Music presentation and a feeling that units could learn a lot from it. During this process it would be helpful for Senate to learn more from the School of Music about what they might in hindsight have done differently.

B. Anderson felt that the underpinnings of these component parts reflected a lot of what had been talked about and felt that the APC had done a stellar job at this first cut. She felt that it might not be possible to come up with the language that everyone could understand but that it was important that everyone have a good enough understanding to be able to explain it to someone else. B. Anderson felt that it would be valuable to spend a little more time on each of the six bullet points in order to make the content very clear. It would be necessary to think about who would be tasked with this particular job.

A. Quema did not see this exercise as at all *creepy*. She felt that this was an attempt by Senate to work out what it wanted to do. No one had been coerced and all Senators had participated in this project. A. Quema felt that it was important to be as precise as possible with the language because if it was not precise it would undermine what Senate was trying to do.

A. Quema felt that Senate needed to work on what its relationship to the Strategic Plan was. The Strategic Plan dated back to 2006 and had become dated by 2016. The Plan was also very vague. A. Quema asked whether there was a desire to turn this exercise into a Strategic Plan.

J. Hennessy felt that the Strategic Plan read more like a vague set of statements and noted that it was not only restricted to the Academic Sector. One of the strengths of this process was that it really focussed on Academic Sector planning. He felt that if Senate declared a set of values that could inform what could be done in all of the units in the future, it would be important to communicate to a future President and to any other individuals that wanted to become a part of the University. Having robust language would be very important.

H. Wyle echoed P. Abela and asked where this language would go? If the language was to be finalized during this cycle of Senate it would be necessary to move very pragmatically as there were few Senate meetings remaining. H. Wyle asked where the final decisions would be going and how would they have the sort of effect that had been discussed.

P. Williams pointed out that Question #2 dealt much more with how these principles would be accomplished. Once Senate had a complete answer to Question #1 he felt that the wording would inform question #2 and that Senate would determine which aspects might be operationalized. Each of these would be passed to a Senate sub-committee to bring back proposals that Senate could then consider for approval.

A. Warner agreed that the existing Strategic Plan was outdated and not as useful to him as it should be, but also felt that the process forward was not clear and needed to be carefully thought out.

P. Abela remembered that in 2006 a firm had been engaged to carry out wide consultation with faculty and staff as well as non-academic units. This was not a Senate-centric activity and as a result it did receive general buy in from faculty and staff. P. Abela felt that if these Senate discussions were likely to lead to a displacement of the Strategic Plan it would be important to create the processes that would create conditions where there would be input outside of Senate from faculty and staff. There would also need to be buy in from faculty and staff. Having those conversations would be important to the eventual success of the project.

The Chair reminded Senators that once Senate had approved the emergent themes they would be forwarded to the Deans to be forwarded to their faculty.

A. Quema agreed and reinforced the point by saying that this was what had been decided at the Senate Executive committee. It was clear and the exercise was intended to give substantive terms of work for the various Senate sub-committees. If Senate affirmed its belief in this set of principles then committees could be put to work on these.

A. Quema felt that there were concrete reasons for the early conversations. It was important to clarify the relationship between what Senate was doing now and the Strategic Plan.

President Ivany agreed with P. Abela that in terms of what needed to be completed during this Senate cycle it would be necessary to bring this work to a point whereby Senate could state that this accurately captured the collaborative work that had begun in the fall. This included the breakout groups, the discussions in Senate, feedback from the APC and satisfaction with the final language. Once complete, that needed to be distributed widely to sub-committees, units and departments. In order for that to happen, Senate

needed to complete their work first.

President Ivany pointed out that if another round of Strategic Planning was to be considered, that would need to be Pan-Institutional and would need to cover everything. This work was the important fundamental foundational work on which future academic planning would be mounted. The Strategic Plan included all aspects of the operation of the University including the academic life of the Institution and this work would feed into that; not replace it. President Ivany noted that in the conversations that were held in the fall there had been a real thirst to get greater clarity around those things that were considered important but had not really been highlighted and declared upon in such a way as to guide the work of Senate.

G. Gibson commented that where Senate went on this really hinged on the discussion of bullet #1 (What was meant by a Liberal Education?). G. Gibson felt that Senate would find that there was already a process in place for many of the items but that this would allow Senate and departments to look at what they were doing.

President Ivany acknowledged the work that A. Loder and her colleagues in the Graduate Student Association carried out on their conference recently. President Ivany noted the level of engagement in the room was palpable and stated that this level of engagement produced a high level of student excellence.

President Ivany stated that at the top tier of liberal arts colleges in the USA some of their curricular had adopted a unifying course that every student in the institution would take. These institutions wanted to have a concrete example of what it was that made their education different. Some of the innovations these colleges had carried out at an extra-curricular level included requiring staff, faculty and students to read a particular book. This book was usually chosen because to some degree the process of extracting and understanding the text captured the goals of the institution. This would become a talking point in their seminars through the year. The book was constantly there as a reference point for everyone within the community. President Ivany noted that this demonstrated that even institutions that were operating in an environment where their particular model was well understood still felt the need to have concrete manifestations of that model in order to have it fully understood.

President Ivany felt that Senate was on the right track and suggested that the APC might like to undertake a short review of other institutions similar to Acadia, to see what they had done to try to draw out and embody those principles that were most important to them.

D Benoit stated that he had held discussions with other faculty members about some of the ideas that had been raised. He felt that this would be a monumental shift for Acadia to make and noted that because Acadia had existed for a long time it could prove difficult to bring to fruition. He felt that although everyone thought they knew what a liberal education was, it had never really been defined until now. With reference to bullet #3 he noted the suggestions of a different approach to teaching and the possibility of a three semester model and stated that at the core one of the things that Acadia had not done was to go further and ask why the degree programs were offered as they were at present. Having taken 4 years to do his undergraduate degree in Nova Scotia he had been surprised to find that in Ontario an undergraduate



degree could be completed in three years. D. Benoit noted that in order to do a fourth year it was necessary to apply and that a student would then automatically become an Honours student. D. Benoit wondered whether Acadia could be holding itself to a different level compared to other institutions and asked whether Acadia standards were too high. Since there were institutions that were offering very different undergraduate programs should Acadia be considering the question of why it was offering four year degrees and should it offer a four year degree program? He noted that in Ontario every student would graduate with an Honours degree if they did four years and that these students were not required to do a thesis presentation.

D. Benoit did not feel that these questions had gone far enough and that it would be better to go back and do what the School of Music had carried out.

A. Kiefte thanked the APC for the work that had been done on the themes. She felt that it was important to be specific and to be as inclusive as possible. A. Kiefte also discussed the outcomes idea of what a degree was when a student graduated from Acadia. She felt that it should be possible to come up with outcomes that were common to all degree programs at Acadia and expected that students would be comfortable with being challenged intellectually, both in their social conceptions and on what their identity was. She noted that the term 'learning outcomes' had a different meaning in Education but felt that it should be possible to speak broadly about outcomes.

A. Kiefte felt that recruitment was extremely important but that it was important to consider the current students and ensure that their programs were rigorous in a healthy way that left them well prepared when they left the University.

L. Aylward referred to bullet #2 and noted that *student centric learning* could be student centered learning and noted that this sort of language would be best avoided because the sort of literature that currently existed in the Education arena on this topic was fairly closed. L. Aylward felt that it was worth spending the time to establish some agreed upon principles that would result in a principle centered campus. Principles could be enacted in a lot of different ways that would make it possible for every student to get a different degree. L. Aylward noted that the principles would provide guidance for the future.

A. Quema referred to bullet #4 asked suggested that the definition of diversity be broadened to include gender. A. Quema asked for clarification about the process that would be followed.

R. Perrins stated that the APC would draft some language to describe the six major themes or principles and invited Senators to email any wordsmithing ideas to him. The APC would circulate a document prior to the April Senate meeting and this would be discussed again at Senate.

L. Aylward felt that the current language was still at themes and not yet at describing principles.

The Chair pointed out that the conversation at the Senate meeting had generated ideas and suggestion to refine the language of the themes. She encouraged Senators to forward their ideas of specific wording to the Chair of the APC and noted that the APC would then create wording for principles.

The Chair noted that the process was unusual for Senate and that it was therefore useful to restate for Senators where the process was going, but also as P. Abela had stated, to look out for any mission creep.

R. Worvill pointed out that the original question was 'where would Acadia like to be in 10 years?'. She asked how what Senate was now discussing related to that original goal.

P. Williams felt that this could be a case of Senate not answering the question that was asked of it!

The Chair thought of it as a combination of an identity statement in terms of 'this is who we are' and where do we want to be in 10 years.

J. MacLeod noted that the original question had not yet been answered yet because the process to determine it was still on-going.

R. Worville noted that because of the original question some of the discussion was about things that were very different from anything that occurred currently at Acadia.

R. Perrins pointed out that the APC was a sub-committee of Senate and asked Senators for advice on behalf of the committee. He asked whether Senate wanted the APC to return in April with the themes re-drafted and word-smithed or did Senate want to see a draft of what the principles associated with these themes would be.

A. Quema asked for clarification between the themes and the principles since the principles were underlying the themes. It was necessary to bring out principles upon which Senate agreed so that it could work as a body and sub-committees could also work effectively. Once a principle was agreed upon the sub-committees would be asked to help with the implementation of the principle.

R. Perrins stated that a theme was how Senate grouped the ideas into six topics whereas a principle was something that Senators all agreed Acadia should work towards as part of the vision or mission of the School. If there was general agreement at Senate that these six themes represented the topics that had been discussed, once the wording was re-done they could be drafted differently and then end up in guiding principles.

A. Quema asked when these would be forwarded to the units.

R. Perrins stated that they could be forwarded now if desired. This might prevent the APC from spending a lot of time developing the principles only to have to re-do them at a later date.

A. Kiefte felt that the language was still very vague at the moment and that it remained unclear to others that were not in the room and having the conversations.

L. Aylward supported the idea of moving forward and establishing the principles.

J. Stanley pointed out that President Ivany had been articulating a view of where Acadia sat in the national university system and had been clear about

where that niche was. J. Stanley felt that there was work to be done inside the university on the academic side to get ready for what 10 years on might look like. It was important to be strong and all move together on this as Acadia moved forward. He felt that this was at the core of everything for the university and if it was done well Acadia's position in the current niche would be strengthened. J. Stanley noted that another Strategic Plan would be a different exercise.

President Ivany asked whether Acadia should also consider values and question what it stood for as an institution relative to the view of how to offer a first rate undergraduate degree. He felt that there would be an interplay between values, mission and direction; and noted that part of this exercise was to get greater clarity of what an Acadia education was, the principles and values that underpinned it and to be able to say that in a declared way, which would inform how Acadia operated Senate and ultimately how curriculum decisions were made along with other decisions. President Ivany felt that that guiding light would describe who we are and who we ascribe to be. He felt that the APC were being asked to come up with broader language but also to determine the core statements of principles and/or values that Acadia needed to make.

D. Holmberg noted that there had not been much discussion on what was meant by the term liberal education. She recalled the process that was adopted when the 2006 Strategic Plan was developed which resulted in vagueness.

D. Holmberg felt that Senators and faculty members shared an idea of what they wanted Acadia to be but trying to define it became complicated. She reminded Senate that the School of Music needed to meet weekly for a period of 2.5 years in order to completely re-vamp their program.

L. Aylward pointed out that Question 1 included reference to the themes and priorities. She felt that more time would be needed.

A. Warner pointed out that bullet #4 *Responding to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Concerns* included quotes that only touched on 21<sup>st</sup> Century concerns. Others such as sustainability were not mentioned. A. Warner felt that there was an extra step to get from the themes to the principles.

J. Hennessy stated that Senate should remember that if the initial question was 'where do you want Acadia to be in 10 years?', this assumed that changes would have taken place. These changes would take a lot of work and consultation and a lot of time. These discussions were important but if they were only going to lead to no change the exercise would have been a waste of time. J. Hennessy felt that the work that it would take to mobilise these themes into actual concrete things would take a long time. J. Hennessy urged Senate to think about the timeline and remember that time needed to be spent discussing the changes that could be made and decisions about what might be preserved and remain the same.

A. Quema asked whether the APC could provide Senate with an idea as to which Senate sub-committee would be responsible for which kind of thematic or principled work. This might give an idea of what the work of Senate would look like for the next two years. A. Quema noted that at Senate Executive there had been discussion of devoting 45 minutes of every Senate meeting to particular areas of work, whereby a sub-committee would be asked to attend Senate and present an item that they were working on. This would allow

Senate to carry some items forward and achieve some results.

D. Holmberg reminded Senate of the questions: where are we now? Where do we want to be in 10 years? How are we going to get there?

The Chair felt that these were the questions that were asked originally. She felt that most members of Senate agreed that the six themes captured the heart of the discussions that were held in December.

The Chair stated that the APC will go back and re-craft the themes to identify principles and values and then undergo the same exercise for Question 2.

The Chair felt that the APC could also indicate which sub-committee of Senate would be tasked with work.

The Chair thanked the APC for the work that the committee had carried out on behalf of Senate

- 6) **New Business**
  - a) **Notice of Motion from the By-laws committee**

The Chair drew to the attention of Senate that the one-month Notice of Motion from the By-laws committee concerning the constitution of the two Curriculum committees, which will be discussed on the floor of Senate at the April meeting.

**Motion to adjourn at 6:00 p.m. Moved by D. Benoit.**

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**

---

R. Hare, Recording Secretary

### Notice of Motion from the By-laws committee

#### Background

**On April 13, 2015, Senate passed a motion approving the division of the Senate Curriculum Committee:**

*“that the Curriculum committee be divided into two standing committees: Curriculum committee (Administrative), which would be responsible for duty one of the present mandate; and Curriculum committee (Policy), which would be responsible for duties two to five of the present mandate.”*

The duties of the Curriculum Committee (as it existed in the past) were:

- (1) to consider recommendations from any Faculty, Department or School for changes in its degree, certificate or diploma regulations and make recommendations to Senate;
- (2) to initiate and make recommendations concerning changes in the curriculum; in particular, to make recommendations concerning the requirements for any degree;
- (3) to consider changes in the curriculum which may be made necessary by changes in secondary school matriculation standards;
- (4) to consider submissions from all departments or schools, or from any individual concerning changes in the curriculum;
- (5) to consider such other matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

The normal process for undergraduate curriculum changes needed for the introduction of new courses or programs, or the modification or deletion of existing courses or programs is as follows:

- development of concept by department or school and completion of SCC form
- consideration by Faculty curriculum committee for recommendation to Faculty Council
- consideration by Faculty Council for recommendation to Senate Curriculum Committee
- consideration by Senate Curriculum Committee for recommendation to Senate
- approval by Senate.

#### MOTION

To amend the By-laws of Senate, beginning in the 2016-17 academic year, to replace the description of the current Senate Curriculum Committee with the descriptions of the two committees below:

*[Note concerning transition of membership: Continuing members on the Curriculum Committee will complete their current terms on either of the two committees. It was recognised that the staggering of terms will be decided when it is known who will continue from the 2015-16 committee.]*

#### **Curriculum Committee (Administrative)**

i. The membership of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. and shall be as follows:

- Registrar† (non-voting, *ex officio*)
- University Librarian or delegate (voting)
- two members from the Faculty of Arts,
- two members from the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science
- two members from the Faculty of Professional Studies
- one member from the Faculty of Theology
- one student
- the chair† of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) committee.

ii). The duties of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) shall be:

- 1) to oversee and co-ordinate all proposed changes in undergraduate degree, certificate or diploma requirements, including interaction with the originators, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such changes.
- 2) to identify issues arising as a result of recommended changes in undergraduate degree, certificate or diploma requirements, and to forward issues to relevant bodies for consideration and action.

- 3) to consider all changes in undergraduate courses from all departments or schools, or from any individual concerning changes in the curriculum, including interaction with the originators, and to make recommendations to Senate concerning such changes.
- 4) to collaborate with the Registrar's office to produce the programs of study and course listings sections of the annual Calendar.
- 5) to consider such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.

**and**

### **Curriculum Committee (Policy)**

i. The membership of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) shall be elected in accordance with Article VI. 1. and shall be as follows:

- Registrar† (non-voting, *ex officio*)
- University Librarian or delegate (voting)
- one member\* the Faculty of Arts
- one member\* the Faculty of Pure & Applied Science
- one member\* the Faculty of Professional Studies
- one member from Faculty of Theology
- one student
- the chair† of the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) committee.

\* one of the members from the Faculties of Arts, Pure and Applied Science and Professional Studies is designated as having specific responsibility for IDST issues, on a rotating basis.

† the members so-marked are members of both committees

ii. The duties of the Curriculum Committee (Policy) shall be:

- 1) to investigate innovative and alternative methods of provision of undergraduate curriculum.  
*Rationale: this ensures the committee is forward-thinking and proactive in its role.*
- 2) to develop policies to ensure that undergraduate curriculum is consistently provided and administered across faculties.  
*Rationale: this ensures the Policy committee will take the initiative in the development of curriculum policies.*
- 3) to ensure that the implementation of policies for undergraduate curriculum is managed, evaluated, revised and disseminated in a coherent and coordinated fashion.  
*Rationale: this provides for the on-going improvement of curriculum policies.*
- 4) to collaborate with the Curriculum Committee (Administrative) to ensure the maintenance of an appropriate structure for the consideration of curricular changes.  
*Rationale: this provides advice and recommendations concerning the procedures used in the consideration of curriculum.*
- 5) to consider such matters as Senate may from time to time entrust to the Committee.